

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

Helen Marie Shreve,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 17-13672

Commissioner of Social Security,

Sean F. Cox

United States District Court Judge

Defendant.

ORDER ADOPTING
12/19/18 REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Plaintiff filed this action seeking judicial review of Defendant Commissioner of Social Security's unfavorable decision denying her claim for Disability Insurance Benefits. The matter was referred to Magistrate Judge Patricia T. Morris for determination of all non-dispositive motions pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Report and Recommendation pursuant to § 636(b)(1)(B) and (C). Thereafter, the parties filed cross-motions for summary judgment.

On December 19, 2018, the magistrate judge issued a Report and Recommendation ("R&R") (ECF No. 20) wherein she recommends that the Court deny Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment, grant Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment, and affirm the Commissioner's decision.

Pursuant to FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b), a party objecting to the recommended disposition of a matter by a Magistrate Judge must file objections to the R&R within fourteen (14) days after being served with a copy of the R&R. "The district judge to whom the case is assigned shall make a *de novo* determination upon the record, or after additional evidence, of any portion of the

magistrate judge's disposition to which specific written objection has been made.” *Id.*

On January 2, 2019, Plaintiff filed timely objections to the R&R. (ECF No. 21). Defendant filed a response to those objections on January 16, 2019. (ECF No. 22).

To properly object to the R&R, however, the “Plaintiff must do more than merely restate the arguments set forth in [his or] her summary judgment motion.” *Senneff v. Colvin*, 2017 WL 710651 at *2 (E.D. Mich. 2017). A district court is not obligated to address objections that are recitations of the same arguments that were addressed by the magistrate judge because “such objections undermine the purpose of the Federal Magistrate’s Act, 28 U.S.C. § 636, which serves to reduce duplicative work and conserve judicial resources.” *Owens v. Commission of Soc. Sec.*, 2013 WL 1304470 at * 3 (W.D. Mich. 2013) (citing *Howard v. Sec’y of Health & Human Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505, 509 (6th Cir. 1991)).

Here, Plaintiff’s objection to the R&R mirrors the arguments she made before the magistrate judge in her summary judgment motion.

As the Commissioner notes in responding to her objection, the magistrate judge carefully considered, and extensively discussed, Plaintiff’s arguments and provided persuasive reasons for rejecting it. (*See* R&R at 21-25). Moreover, the Court agrees with the magistrate judge’s analysis and conclusions as to these arguments.

Accordingly, the Court hereby ADOPTS the December 19, 2018 R&R and ORDERS that Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment is DENIED, Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment is GRANTED, and the Commissioner’s decision is AFFIRMED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 12, 2019

s/ Sean F. Cox
Sean F. Cox
U. S. District Judge